

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been combined. New claims which find basis on Table 1 on page 8, have been added for consideration. It is respectfully submitted that the claims as so amended are patentable over the references and reason set forth in the office action.

The claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Arai in view of Egusa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is based, *inter alia*, on the discovery that an improved organic EL display element is realized when there is a stress relaxation layer and that layer is such that the absolute value of the film stresses of the cathode and the stress relaxation layer is 10 (N/m) or less. There is no teaching or suggestion of this feature in the references.

Arai discloses an organic EL display element and does, as noted by the Examiner, make reference to the internal stress of the protective electrode. However, it should be recognized that "internal stress" and "film stress" are different. The film stress, also called "bending force per unit width" in the thin layer technology field, is defined as the value set forth in N/m obtained by multiplying the internal stress in N/m² of a layer by the thickness of that layer. It will be appreciated that there is nothing in Arai which teaches or suggests that absolute value of the film stress of the cathode and the stress relaxation layer should total ten (10) or less.

The Egusa reference has not been cited with respect to this aspect of the invention and cannot, therefore, cure the basic deficiency in Arai. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

The claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Sasaoka in view of Egusa. The Sasaoka reference suffers from the same deficiency as Arai in that it relates to internal stress rather than film stress. There is nothing in this reference that teaches or suggests that the film stress sum should be 10 or less. Again, Egusa has not been cited to overcome this deficiency. Withdrawal of this rejection is, accordingly, respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

EAM/ll2